Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/598,972	BRIGGS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ROBERT W. HORN	2832	
All Participants:	Participants: Status of Application: <u>response to non-final action</u>		
(1) <u>ROBERT W. HORN</u> .	(3)		
(2) Melissa L. B. Lyons, Esquire.	(4)		
Date of Interview: 7 December 2009	Time: <u>11:00</u>		
Type of Interview:			
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed: obviousness			
Claims discussed: 1, 3, 4, 9, and 25			
Prior art documents discussed: prior art of record			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet			
Part III.			
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 			
(A	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)	

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: the examiner requested an interview by fax on 12/4/2009, and proposed amendments substantially as posted in the action for examiner's amendment. The examiner called the attorney and confirmed that there was general interested, contingent on the interest by the applicant. In the official interview minor tweaking to the claim language resulted in the examiner's proposal. The phrase "interposed planar web" was changed to --interposed web--. Claims 3 and 4 reverted to submitted form. The phrase "unitary" modifying "body" was struck.

The state of the claims was accept as modified and the examiner agreed to submit thes by examiner's amendment and allow the case to advance prosecution.